PERIODICAL ROOM
GENERAL LIBRARY
UNIV. OF MICH.

# CLASSICAL WEEKLY

VOL. 34, NO. 16 March 10, 1941 WHOLE NO. 916

MAR 14 1941

## REVIEWS

SCRAMUZZA, Emperor Claudius (*Perry*); ROSENBERGER, Griechische Verwaltungsurkunden von Tebtynis (*Youtie*); WISSOWA, KROLL, MITTELHAUS, Paulys Real-Encyclopädie², Supplementband 7 (*Kraemer*); KLINGNER, Horatius, Carmina (*Jolliffe*); BATES, Sophocles, Poet and Dramatist (*Godolphin*); VER EECKE, Euclide. L'Optique et la Catoptrique (*Barry*); SULLIVAN, First Principles in Thought and Being (*King*); BROWN, Temples of Rome as Coin Types (*Clement*); GALLUS, HORVATH, Peuple cavalier préscythique en Hongrie (*Vernadsky*)

## ABSTRACTS OF ARTICLES

TWO BOOKS TO REMEMBER

THE ROMAN'S WORLD
by Frank Gardner Moore
"Very useful and well-arranged book."—Classical Weekly. $3.75, illus.

GREEK LIFE AND THOUGHT
by La Rue Van Hook
"The best treatise dealing with the field chosen."—Classical Weekly. $2.50, illus.

Write for full information
COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY PRESS
Morningside Heights – New York

# CLASSICAL WEEKLY

Published weekly (each Monday) except in weeks in which there is an academic vacation or Armistice Day, Thanksgiving Day, Christmas, New Year's Day, Washington's Birthday, Easter, or Memorial Day. A volume contains approximately twenty-five issues.

Owner and Publisher: The Classical Association of the Atlantic States. Place of Publication: University of Pittsburgh, 4200 Fifth Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. Printed by The Beaver Printing Company, Greenville, Pennsylvania.

James Stinchcomb, Editor; Jotham Johnson, Associate Editor, University of Pittsburgh, 4200 Fifth Avenue, Pittsburgh, Penna. John F. Gummere, Secretary and Treasurer, 418 South Wycombe Avenue, Lansdowne, Pennsylvania.
Contributing Editors: Lionel Casson, Eugene W. Miller, Norman T. Pratt, Bluma L. Trell, Edna White.

Price, $2.00 per volume in the Western Hemisphere; elsewhere $2.50. All subscriptions run by the volume. Single numbers: to subscribers 15 cents, to others 25 cents prepaid (otherwise 25 cents and 35 cents). If affidavit to invoice is required, sixty cents must be added to the subscription price.

Entered as second-class matter October 14, 1938, at the post office at Pittsburgh, Pa., under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in the Act of February 28, 1925, authorized October 14, 1938.

Volume 34 contains issues dated: October 7, 14, 21, 28; November 4, 18; December 2, 9, 16 (1940); January 6, 13, 20; February 10, 24; March 3, 10, 17, 24, 31; April 14, 21, 28; May 5, 12, 19; June 2 (1941).

## COMING ATTRACTIONS

MARCH 28 St. Louis University

CLASSICAL CLUB OF ST. LOUIS

President: Professor E. S. Tavenner, Washington University

Speakers: Professor Walter Miller, Washington University: Vergil

Professor James A. Kleist, S. J., St. Louis University: Objectives in Secondary Latin

APRIL 4-5 Tufts College

CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION OF NEW ENGLAND

President: Miss Susan E. Shennan, New Bedford High School

Secretary: Professor John W. Spaeth, Jr., Wesleyan University

APRIL 10-12 Hotel Severin, Indianapolis

CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION OF THE MIDDLE WEST AND SOUTH

President: Professor Gertrude Smith, University of Chicago

APRIL 25-26 Mayflower Hotel, Washington

CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION OF THE ATLANTIC STATES

ANNUAL MEETING

Friday Afternoon, April 25 Papers and Reports
Friday Evening Dinner Meeting
Saturday Morning, April 26 Papers and Conferences
Saturday Afternoon Luncheon at the invitation of Sidwell Friends School
Business Meeting and Papers

LOCAL COMMITTEE ON ARRANGEMENTS

Chairman: Miss Mildred Dean, Calvin Coolidge High School, President of The Washington Classical Club

Dr. Frank W. Ballou, Superintendent of Schools

Miss Margaret Dorsey, Deal Junior High School

Mrs. M. W. Doyle, President of the Board of Education

Professor L. Ingemann Highby, University of Maryland

Mr. A. R. Hoxton, Episcopal High School

Mr. Stephen A. Hurlbut, National Cathedral School for Boys

Dr. John S. Kieffer, St. John's College

Dr. John Latimer, George Washington University

Rev. Daniel McFadden, S. J., Georgetown University

Dean M. R. P. McGuire, Catholic University of America

Mr. Peter Marshall, New York Avenue Presbyterian Church

Mr. Albert E. Rogers, Sidwell Friends School

Sister Julia, Trinity College

Sister Margaret Mary, Georgetown Visitation Convent

Gen. Oliver Spaulding, U. S. A., retired

Mrs. E. V. Stearns, Roosevelt High School

Dr. Bernice Wall, Taft Junior High School

Rev. W. E. Welsh, S. J., Georgetown Preparatory School

Miss L. M. Wing, Miss Madeira's School for Girls

Miss Ruth Wofford, Calvin Coolidge High School

Reservations for the annual Dinner Meeting are now being received by the Washington Committee; room reservations go directly to the Mayflower Hotel.

JUNE 21 - AUGUST 2 Princeton University

SEMINAR IN ARABIC AND ISLAMIC STUDIES

Director: Professor Philip K. Hitti, Princeton University

JULY 11-12 University of North Carolina

LINGUISTIC SOCIETY OF AMERICA

Summer Meeting

# REVIEWS

**The Emperor Claudius.** By VINCENT M. SCRAMUZZA. 328 pages, 1 map. Harvard University Press, Cambridge 1940 (Harvard Historical Studies 44) $3.75

According to traditional accounts, the emperor Claudius was a weak, dull-witted, and wholly ridiculous figure, and therefore altogether unfitted for public life. Mr. Scramuzza, however, after a careful study of the documents and literary evidence of his reign, has this to say of him:

> His own utterances which have been transmitted to us in stone, bronze or papyrus, few though they are, show that he possessed sound practical judgment and no little political wisdom. His administration was enlightened in domestic affairs. In the foreign field he solved with dignity the main problems inherited from his predecessors. He endowed the Principate with those policies which, continued by Vespasian, Trajan, and Hadrian, made it more efficient and at the same time more humane. Despite these facts the cumulative judgment of antiquity agrees in portraying him as a fool and a baneful influence on the development of the Empire. Although this discrepancy between Claudius' record and its appraisal by ancient writers had been noted for some time, it was the discovery in 1920 or 1921 of a letter of his to the city of Alexandria that made that appraisal no longer tenable. Upon careful analysis, this document so contradicts the judgment tradition has given of the fourth Emperor as to challenge students of Roman history to a fresh inquiry into the whole problem of his personality and achievements. (3)

The author undertakes, therefore, as the specific purpose of his work, "to seek new light on the motives and principles that actuated" Claudius' administration (4). He is not primarily interested in finding new data. His avowed method is to investigate Claudius' problems with due regard for the Emperor's character, for the time in which he lived, and for precedent, a principle of the writing of history which, in his opinion, the ancient authorities did not closely regard.

The author divides his subject matter into eleven chapters. He reaches in the main the following conclusions: that political bias was largely responsible for the traditional conception of Claudius; that far from being a puppet emperor, Claudius really wielded the dominant power; that he respected the policies of Augustus and followed them in many instances; that Roman statistics do not show that Claudius was reckless with the franchise; that his letter to the Alexandrians "reveals him as a ruler familiar with the issues he is called upon to decide, conscious of the majesty of his office but personally modest, strong in asserting his rights but urbane even when chiding" (79); that he admittedly infringed upon some of the rights of the Senate, but only in the interests of good government.

In reading the book, one is reminded of Momigliano's Claudius, the Emperor and His Achievements (Oxford 1934), written from a somewhat similar standpoint. Both writers agree that the judgment of antiquity with respect to Claudius was not correct, and that discoveries of new material in inscriptions and papyri warrant a decided modification of the ancient tradition.

Mr. Scramuzza's work should be of interest to the student and historian, particularly. The discussions in general are painstaking. The notes, which are placed at the back of the book, contain much interesting and valuable material. The list of abbreviations at the end of the text serves also as a bibliography. The map to be found in the pocket is handy for reference. On the whole, the work is a credit to the Harvard Historical Series

O. C. PERRY

UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO

**Griechische Verwaltungsurkunden von Tebtynis aus dem Anfang des dritten Jahrhunderts n. Chr.** (P. bibl. univ. Giss. 47-53). Edited by GRETE ROSENBERGER. iv, 44 pages. Privately printed, Giessen 1939 (Mitteilungen aus der Papyrussammlung der Giessener Universitätsbibliothek, VI)

Miss Rosenberger is well known to papyrologists, especially through her edition of private letters (P. Iandanae VI) and her solution of a difficult problem in the mathematics of grain accounts (Archiv für Papyrusforschung XII 70ff.). The present volume adds seven documents to the already abundant material from Tebtunis; it comes as a small cousin among distinguished elders.

Each papyrus in Miss Rosenberger's slender volume bears its date, and the seven texts extend from the 21st year of Caracalla to the third year of Severus Alexander (213-25 A.D.). They all in some way illustrate the taxation of Egypt in the early third century and the administrative system set up for the assessment, collection, and transport of taxes in money and in kind. Unfortunately, Miss Rosenberger's documents bring nothing strikingly new, but they are competently and exhaustively edited.

No. 47 is a narrow roll containing seven receipts, each in a column of its own, for payments of the weavers' tax by Heraklas and his father Belles during a period of five years, 213-7 A.D. The receipts bear witness to a normal annual rate of 38 dr. 2 ob., which was previously attested, but the total payments in 217 A.D. were 40 dr. and 28 dr. respectively. The payments of Heraklas are seemingly on his own account, but his father Belles pays on behalf of a third person whose name is Protas. A doubtful reading in Col. IV recto, 5 represents Heraklas as making a single payment of 4 dr. on behalf of his father. At the same time, the 4 dr. go to make up Heraklas' total dues of 38 dr. 2 ob.

for the year. Miss Rosenberger's long note on this difficulty is not convincing; the doubtful reading leads to a more doubtful interpretation. What is expected is either a second instalment for the same month (Hathyr) with no reference to Belles or an instalment for the month Choiak. The latter alternative would be completely satisfying if it were true since the preceding entry is for Hathyr and the following for Tybi. In any event the connection of Belles is obscure; the papyrus might well be reexamined at this point.

The weavers' tax is represented in these receipts as collected by *μισθωταὶ ἱερατικῶν ὠνῶν*, and Miss Rosenberger's introduction is given over largely to a consideration of these officials and the character of the *ἱ. ὠ.* In the latter I am inclined to see contracts for the collection of taxes on temple industries (No. 47 weaving; 48 brewing), and Rostovtzeff's conception of *μισθωταί* and *ἐπιτηρηταί* is sound. The latter are government overseers, obviously liturgical officials, charged with collection of specified taxes. The former are likewise liturgical officials, but their functions and obligations are expressed in the form of a lease. In view of what we now know of the Roman administration of Egypt, the existence of parallel offices is not surprising.

No. 48 is a receipt issued by a *μισθωτὴς ἱ. ὠ.* to the elders of the village of Kerkesis for monthly payments of the beer tax at 32 dr. from Thoth through Pharmouthi, 28 dr. 24 ob. for Pachon and Pauni, and 28 dr. 20 ob. for Epeiph in the third year of Severus Alexander (224-5 A.D.). This text is a beautiful illustration of the way in which the wealthier men of the villages were being saddled with the responsibility of gathering in the taxes. A whole series of receipts issued to village elders is preserved in P. Strassb. 58-69. As members of the socially and politically privileged class they had been spared to a great extent in the first century. The following century, however, saw the full development of the burdensome system of liturgies, and in the third century Egypt was sliding with ever-increasing momentum down the incline from which not even the shrewd reforms of Diocletian could rescue her.

Miss Rosenberger has attempted to reconcile all the amounts recorded in this papyrus with a uniform monthly rate of 32 dr. divided evenly among eight persons. This she has been able to do by assuming that 6 obols make 1 drachma or, in other terms, 24 obols make 1 tetradrachm, and hence 28 dr. 24 ob.=32 dr., and 28 dr. 20 ob. with the help of a doubtful remark on the verso = 28 dr. 24 ob. = 32 dr. However, the form in which the statements are made should have warned the editor away from any such assumption. The tetradrachm concerned here is not the traditional one of 24 obols, but the Egyptian tetradrachm worth 28 or 29 obols which was generally current in Roman Egypt. It is evident that 28 dr. 24 ob. are not stated as 32 dr. because 4 or 5 more obols are necessary to make up that amount.

Nos. 49-51 constitute a homogeneous group since they all contain reports from the sitologus Aurelius Polion addressed to Aurelius Sereniscus also called Hermesias, strategus of the Themistes and Polemon divisions of the Arsinoite nome. The latter was hitherto known to have been in office from 224 to 226 A.D., but No. 49 pushes back the earlier limit to 220 by providing a new date for P. Tebt. II, 339, which is a similar report from the same sitologus to the same strategus.

The recto of No. 49 has two drafts of a report for the month Pauni of the fourth year of Helagabalus (221 A.D.). The second copy was necessitated by the presence of serious errors of calculation in the first. There is nothing remarkable in the report since it belongs to a well known type, but Miss Rosenberger's skill in elucidating the arithmetical difficulties of the text is superb. On the verso are four columns of a daybook of payments of barley into the granary from Pauni 19 to 27, but the daybook appears not to belong to the same year as the drafts on the recto. The distribution of material on the two sides of the sheet is more complex than I have indicated; anyone who is interested will need to study closely the editor's description.

A technical difficulty is raised by Miss Rosenberger's restoration of the fraction 1/3 1/4 1/8 in Col. IV recto, 27. The Egyptian system does not permit the fraction to be expressed in that way. The correct form is 2/3 1/24 (cf., e.g., P. Kalén 4 Verso I, 17; III, 8; IV, 11; B.G.U. IX, 1893, 230) on the principle that the first fraction must be the highest in the permissible series, the second the next highest, etc. Failure to reckon with this procedure has led the editor of B.G.U. IX to conclude that the edition in 1893, 298 is wrong, but the clerk merely substituted 1/3 1/24 for 1/4 1/8.

No. 50 was intended to be a report on grain received in the granary at Tebtunis on Phaophi 2, 221 A.D. The amount, however, was never entered, and an attempt was made to wash off the text with a sponge.

No. 51, like No. 49, is a monthly summary report, and it covers Mecheir in 222 A.D. In that month no grain was received into the granary, but 5 artabas of wheat were turned over to Aurelius Ammonius, a pilot serving the Alexandrian office of the administration of grain transport and probably identical with the pilot of P. Oxy. XVII, 2125.

No. 52 is a report from two *amphodon* secretaries of Tebtunis, directed probably to the strategus of the Themistes and Polemon divisions, in the first or second year of Severus Alexander (222 or 223 A.D.). Like P. Gron. 2 (219-20 A.D.), it calls itself a *πορεία πρὸς ἐπίσκεψιν ἀβρόχου γῆς*, a preliminary list of land that

had not enjoyed the benefits of inundation. Such records were compiled by village secretaries from a comparison of the declarations of unwatered land filed by owners and lessees with the official cadastre, and subsequently were used as a check by the commission which was charged with inspection of land claimed to have received too little or too much water. In accordance with findings of this commission rents and taxes were lowered and raised. The papyri show that the checks employed—declarations from individuals, preliminary collation of these with the cadastre, recommendations of the commission of inspection—were necessary, because landholders and lessees tended to be very generous with themselves in claiming reductions of rents and taxes.

No. 53, the last of Miss Rosenberger's seven documents, is addressed to Aurelius Sereniscus also called Hermesias, strategus of the Themistes and Polemon divisions, to whom Nos. 49-51 are also addressed. The field guards of Tebtunis in 223 A.D. promise with an oath taken in the name of the emperor Severus Alexander to supervise the transportation of grain from the fields to the usual threshing floors, to see that none is left in the field, and to permit no admixture of Nile reeds in the grain. The oath was written by one of the guards, Palotes, who signed his name under the text and gave his own signalment. A second guard, Pamoutis, did the same. A third hand added the date.

This document falls into a well defined category of promissory oaths submitted by liturgical officials. Very similar is P. Oxy. X, 1255 (292 A.D.), in which comarchs of a village in the Oxyrhynchite nome swear that they will allow none of the crops to be removed from the threshing floors until the dues to the fiscus have been paid. Of special interest in this connection is a document of the second century B.C. (Wilcken, Chrestomathie 331; P. Tebt. I, 27), which prescribes the oath to be taken by guards of the crops. They shall "convey the produce to the appointed places, and let nothing go until the proclamation concerning the release of crops is published." Both of these papyri have been cited by Miss Rosenberger, who misses very little in the course of her editorial activity.

HERBERT C. YOUTIE

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

**Paulys Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft**[2], edited by GEORG WISSOWA, WILHELM KROLL and KARL MITTELHAUS. Supplementband VII, Adobogiona bis Τριακαδιεῖς, mit Nachträgen. 1664 columns. Metzler, Stuttgart 1940 33 M.

It seems almost as a conscious tour de force that Pauly-Wissowa continues its steady march to completion, war or no war. Aside from the inevitable changes in the contributors, the omission of names long familiar and the appearance of a new and younger generation of scholars, there is nothing in the bulky volume to indicate that conditions in Germany have in any way changed. It may be even fanciful to see a repercussion of current politics in the appearance of a new article by E. Littmann on Adula, the ancient harbor of Ethiopia just south of Massaua.

Despite the fact that this is only a supplementary volume, there is much fresh material. Quite the most significant of the new articles is the exhaustive treatment of Theophrastos by O. Regenbogen, which occupies more than 200 columns. Perhaps the next most significant article is that on Terra Sigillata by Howard Comfort. Others of importance are: daimonismos (Pfister), Dura (Watzinger), Narbo (Goessler), noxa and noxalis actio (Lisowski), Odyssee (Von der Mühll), Peripatos (Brink), Rhetorik (Kroll), Rind (Kraemer), Susa (Christian), Tissaphernes (Schaefer), Todesstrafe (Berger), ludi circenses (Regner).

Many of the articles which appear as supplementary notes are practically complete in themselves. Of these the most important are the following: agri decumates (Sontheimer), Dreros (Kirsten), Haus (D. M. Robinson), Lato (Kirsten), Minturnae (Johnson), Oidipus (Daly), peristylium (Sulze), Pherai (Kirsten), and many supplementary notes to various *leges* (Berger).

Once more it is a pleasure to see the list of American scholars whose work appears in this admirable setting: Howard Comfort, L. W. Daly, Sterling Dow, Kurt von Fritz, Jotham Johnson, W. A. Oldfather, D. M. Robinson and W. L. Westermann.

CASPER J. KRAEMER, JR.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA AT LOS ANGELES

**Horatius, Carmina.** Edited by FRIEDRICH KLINGNER. XX, 379 pages. Teubner, Leipzig 1939 9.45 M.

The new Teubner Horace considerably clears up the relationship of the significant manuscripts but does not, of course, solve the problems presented by dual readings. For there are two traditions, each true in some places and faulty in others. Klingner calls these Ξ and Ψ—the "class II" and "class III" of Keller and Holder, to which he returns after demonstrating the weaknesses in Vollmer's oversimplification. Keller and Holder also had a "class I" and tried to determine true readings on the specious principle that any two classes outweighed the third. Later scholars dismissed "class I" as a hybrid.

Klingner summarizes what he wrote in Hermes 70 (1935) 249ff. and 361ff. to prove that "class I" (which he calls Q) descends from an early-ninth-century archetype derived from the archetypes of the other two classes. Hence it is a tail that has no right to wag the

dog but may occasionally preserve a reading lost in the other two classes. Klingner also shows how R, which Vollmer put in a wrong relationship, was derived from Ψ and Q in a manner similar to the derivation of Q from Ξ and Ψ. Most of the Keller and Holder manuscripts are used with their old symbols. Additions are Vollmer's K, previously neglected parts of R, and the Vatican Ottobonianus lat. 1660 (late IX cent.).

Ancient testimonia are set apart from the rest of the critical apparatus on each page. Next comes a statement of what currently constitutes Ξ and Ψ. For variant readings the support of Ξ, Ψ, and the scholia are shown, and only those manuscripts which desert their group at that point. Some space is saved by eliminating minor orthographical variants and a number of gratuitous conjectures.

Klingner's readings differ from Keller and Holder's in some places where the latter arbitrarily applied their "two against one" theory. In about a dozen places he deserts K-H, Vollmer, and the testimony of both his classes to adopt a reading with little or no support beyond Cruquius' "oldest Blandine," which a monastery fire consumed long before the era of modern scholarship. Klingner begs the question in assuming a third authentic ancient source for some of its readings. Its one sure contribution, *res sponsore* (Ep. 1.16.43), may well have been a late correction. Its famous *campum lusumque trigonem* (supported by g at S. 1.6.126) is adopted here as usual, but it was Bentley who removed *rabiosi tempora signi* by a logic that requires re-examination in the light of Horace's style and Bentley's method at other points.

Other Blandine readings which Klingner might well have rejected are: *flexus* (C. 4.6.21), *versemur* (S. 1.3.60), and *amet* (S. 1.4.87). The last occurs where a dinner guest wants (*avet*) to shower everyone but the host with his wise-cracks. Heinze reflected the unimaginative logic of Bentley when he objected that *avet* merely says he *wants* to, not that he *does*. Bentley dies hard in the German texts. Mistakenly arguing that *amare* must mean *solere*, Bentley was inspired to make the reverse conjecture of *avet* for *amat* in Ep. 1.14.9, which Klingner needlessly accepts, as he does *Calenam* (C. 1.31.9), *offensi* (Epod. 15.15), *quam rem* (S. 2.6.29), *olea* (Ep. 2.1.31) and the inversion of A.P. 45-6. Wickham's Oxford text had none of these.

To give Klingner his due, however, he did remove from their position in the Vollmer text *Edonis* (C. 3.25.9), *qua* (S. 1.8.15), *tu* (S. 2.3.234), *podagrum* (Ep. 1.2.52), and *securisque* (C. 3.26.7, where mirabile dictu Vollmer thought more of Bentley's conjecture than Bentley did himself). Space will not permit discussion of other such dubious readings as *poetis* (S. 1.4.39) and *Marsi* (C. 1.2.39).

Well-supported readings such as *visit* for *urit* (C. 1.4.8) and *hoc deos vere* (C. 1.8.2) may not appeal to some, if only because they are less used to them. There is never likely to be complete agreement, but Klingner differs only one quarter as often from a clear majority of six recent critical editions as he differs from any one of them individually.

There is danger here, too, however. For example, the easier reading *silebo* for *sileri* is coming to be the customary one in C. 4.9.31, but have the editors noticed that those manuscripts which support it have also changed an innocent *perire* (52) to *peribit* in the same poem?

When Bentley, for a ridiculous reason long since forgotten, changed *ullius* to the *illius* of a few inconsequential codices at Ep. 1.18.37, he put a problem into the poem which has bothered most subsequent commentators. Yet not one editor within the reviewer's knowledge has returned to the manuscripts. By analyzing the whole epistle in my Critical Methods and Influence of Bentley's Horace, I think I have shown conclusively that *ullius* should be restored. Many intensive studies by others are more worthy of consideration, and it is by the careful collection and evaluation of these, perhaps, that critical texts of the future may be improved and brought closer together. For, as Klingner concludes, "quid verum sit, nec numero neque auctoritate testium diiudicari potest: expendendae sunt lectiones singulae."

The valuable indices of Vollmer have been retained. The format is enlarged. Ancient spellings such as *divom* and *vacuom* have been removed when unsupported by a manuscript. This leads to admitted inconsistencies. Deliberate variations such as *bubus* and *bobus*, *pulcher* and *pulcer* are found. Nineteen lines are bracketed. Three transpositions of lines and one dagger were noted. Conjectures are few but could be fewer. Klingner seems to have added none of his own.

Klingner's Horace is welcomed for its generally excellent text (for one man's criticism will be another man's praise) and because, in addition to further unraveling of the tradition, it supplies us with a generous and accurate citation of manuscripts at a time when Keller and Holder is becoming a very scarce volume in this country.

HAROLD R. JOLLIFFE

OHIO UNIVERSITY, ATHENS

**Sophocles, Poet and Dramatist.** By WILLIAM NICKERSON BATES. xiii, 291 pages, 6 plates, 4 figures. University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia 1940 $3.50.

Readers of Professor Bates' previously published Euripides will not be surprised to learn that this

volume is divided into five parts: I The Life of Sophocles, II The Dramatic Art of Sophocles, III The Satyr Dramas, IV The Extant Tragedies, V The Lost Plays, with an appendix listing the fragments found in papyri.

In the first chapter the usual handbook information about the poet is treated in some detail with adequate documentation. In the second chapter a number of random remarks are put together on such topics as plot, character, irony, humour, stage devices, style, and the chorus. A brief treatment of the satyr plays refers the reader to the discussions in chapter five in which the treatment of all the lost plays is in essence a simplification of Jebb-Pearson with occasional additions to the bibliography in Pearson.

The 128-page chapter on the extant plays is so divided that approximately three-fourths of the space is devoted to summaries of the plays in prose or not very inspired verse. In the remainder the author undertakes to satisfy the "large company of American readers" for whom "a translation however good is not enough." Since Bates believes that "they want more information about the writer and his work, and above all they want to know the evidence upon which statements about him are based," it is clear that he does not expect the reader to demand any interpretation of the significance of the plays or any consideration of the fundamental issues involved or indeed any effort to recreate the atmosphere of the plays for greater enjoyment and better understanding. The limitations of Bates' approach may be indicated by comparison with Gilbert Murray's statement in the preface to his recent volume on Aeschylus, "The few very great books of the world, the books which at the end of over two thousand years have still the power to stir our pulses with their beauty and inspire our minds with the vitality of their thought, have a special value for humanity and must not be allowed to die." The information conveyed by Bates proves, in each case, to consist largely of a discussion of the date of the play, its fame, and a description of the character of each of the dramatis personae.

There is little in this volume to suggest that there is anything about Sophocles' work of greater value than the work of Suidas or Tzetzes in respect to either form or content. The fault lies neither in lack of industry nor in lack of ability but apparently in a failure of the imagination. A paragraph or two on each of a hundred lost plays is of little value to the specialist and the stories of the myths are far better read as mythology than as possible plot material, when nothing is known of the poet's dramatic handling or interpretation. In the case of extant plays even if the reader must depend upon a translation it is better to have the play complete so that he may have some conception of its structure and content, instead of providing him with a running summary topped off with a mechanical analysis of the characters. Either the subject is not worth treating, or it deserves far more thoughtful and imaginative presentation based on sound and careful scholarship. This volume provides nothing of importance for the specialist and little that is of value for the general reader.

F. R. B. GODOLPHIN

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY

**Euclide. L'Optique et la Catoptrique.** Avec une introduction et des notes. By PAUL VER EECKE. xlvii, 123 pages. Desclée de Brouwer, Bruges 1938

It is not generally known, excepting among those who have given considerable attention to the study of Greek mathematics, that the author of the immortal Elements of Geometry wrote no less than ten other mathematical treatises. One of these, the Conics, now lost, was a systematic presentation, similar to the Elements though necessarily far less thoroughly developed, of the geometry of plane curves of the second degree so far as this was then known; and others, notably the extant Data and the lost Pseudaria, were methodical works, illustrations of procedure good and bad, designed for the use of those who, having mastered the fundamentals, were training themselves for independent investigation.

All these, like the greater part of the Elements, might properly be called educational works; two others, however, like the famous tenth book of the Elements, appear to have been records of advanced original research. It is a great misfortune that both the work on Porisms and that on Surface Loci are lost, for they dealt with the most general problems attacked by the Greek geometers, those on loci and projection, and, being of the sort that extended Greek methods of mathematical study to the furthest limit of their applicability, seem to have foreshadowed the modern development of certain important inclusive geometrical principles.

Euclid's methods, however, were not limited to the prosecution of such researches. Participating in the expansion of the domain of mathematics that was finally to establish it as the foundation of all theoretical physical science, he wrote also on the application of geometry to the study of astronomical, musical, optical and (possibly, though not certainly) mechanical phenomena; and of his labors in this field there still survive two records: his work on Phaenomena, which applied the geometry of the uniformly rotating sphere to astronomical observations, and his Optics, which is the earliest work that is known on the geometry of perspective.

It is this last work which, together with an ancient

emendation of it written by Theon of Alexandria six hundred years later and a related Catoptrica, or treatise on mirrors, which, though not Euclid's own, is probably based upon his work, Ver Eecke has translated and criticized in the present volume. The author is already well known to students of Greek science because of his excellent French translations of several Greek mathematical classics, among which that of the Synagoge of Pappus is an invaluable addition to the original literature now, thanks to the labors of Sir Thomas Heath, available in English.

The present book, though less important than those that have preceded, is none the less most interesting to the student of developing thought, since it reveals to us the first stages in the theoretical organization of geometric optics, and in so doing gives sharp definition to the now obsolete theory of vision that prevailed throughout antiquity—a primitive theory based on the Pythagorean notion of "visual rays" which, emanating from the eye, were supposed to be the cause of sight. The persistence of this theory (which seems not to have been effectively criticized before the Middle Ages) is at once evidence of a surprising ignorance of the function of the eye, even after the rise of minute anatomy in Alexandria, and a no less startling illustration—the later achievements of Archimedes, Heron and Ptolemy being kept in mind—of the fertile truism that in science a false theory is far better than none. With respect to its formal aspect, the Optics is of course much simpler than the Elements, since it summarizes a relatively meagre knowledge while the Elements are based on the results of two centuries or more of intensive work. The study of optics had in Euclid's time only just begun; and in its development it is for similar reasons defective, though not sufficiently so to justify its rejection as the work of Euclid, or essentially his work. These characteristics, however, only add to its historical interest.

Ver Eecke's book is in four parts: an introduction of 38 pages, and literal translations of the presumably original Optics, of Theon's altered transcription of this, and of the Catoptrica. To all but geometers or critical students of geometry the introduction will provide an adequate knowledge of these treatises. It is an interesting exposition. A general discussion of the circumstances under which the works were written and of their character is followed by an analysis of the Optics in which the "Definitions" (postulates and theoretical hypotheses based on the notion of "visual rays") are examined and all the 58 propositions summarized and criticized. Then, after a brief account of the fate of this original work, the recension of Theon is more briefly considered; and, concluding the critical discussion, the Catoptrics is, like the Optics, treated in detail, its presuppositions and its 30 propositions summarized. Finally, then, the history of the manuscripts that have come down to us and a commentary on the successive printed editions of the works is appended.

In the Optics, the first proposition is among the most interesting, in that it states that one never sees the whole of a visible surface at once, since the visual rays from the eye, diverging in a cone of light, leave spaces between them that cannot be seen excepting by movement of the eye. The basic propositions having been thereafter developed, they are applied to the estimation of actual heights and distances and then to the demonstration that the apparent sizes of equal and parallel magnitudes are not exactly proportional to their distances from the eye. By reference to this it is then shown that with one eye we see less than the half of a sphere, and with two eyes more than half of it if the sphere looked at is smaller than the distance between the eyes, less than half if this distance is greater. These proportions attract particular interest since their equivalent was used about a century later by Aristarchus of Samos in his measurement of the sizes and distances of the sun and moon. Still more interesting, however, are the fifty-first and fifty-second propositions, which are to this effect:

> If several magnitudes move with different velocities, then if the eye moves with them in the same direction, those which have the same velocity as that of the eye seem to stand still, those which move more slowly seem to move backward, and those that move more rapidly seem to move forward.
>
> If a stationary magnitude is viewed from a moving body, the stationary magnitude seems to move in the opposite sense.

In the Catoptrics are treated the phenomena of reflection from plane mirrors and from spherical mirrors both convex and concave. As in the Optics, the rectilinear propagation of light is assumed. The first proposition is a statement of the law of reflection. It is noticeable that this law, first established for the case of the plane mirror, is not postulated, as it would have been had it been determined directly by angular measurement, but is deduced from the assumption that the straight lines drawn from the eye and from its reflected image perpendicular to the mirror are proportional to the corresponding lengths of the straight lines on the mirror's surface between these perpendiculars and the point of incidence; which suggests an experimental procedure (by which this "definition" was doubtless determined) of linear measurement only; and it is also noticeable that, the law having been established for the plane mirror, it is expressed for the spherical mirrors in terms of the complete divergence of the incident and reflected rays from the mirror surfaces, the horn angles between the tangents at the point of incidence and this surface being taken to be equal. This indicates, of course, that in Euclid's time propositions on horn angles were current; which may account for the inclusion of

their definition in the Elements although there are no propositions concerning them in that work.

This first proposition of the Catoptrics is followed by others on perpendicular and oblique reflections from both plane and spherical mirrors, on the conditions that determine the divergence, convergence and crossing of reflected rays, on the positions of object and image relative to the mirror and to one another, their relative dimensions, inversions and distortions, and on multiple reflections. The treatise closes with a proposition, in part at least interpolated, on burning-mirrors; in which the centre and focus of a spherical concave mirror are first distinguished but later confused—which indicates either a knowledge but imperfect understanding in Euclid's day of the concentration of radiant heat by reflection, or the existence at a later time of a work now lost (which Ver Eecke is inclined to ascribe to Archimedes) the demonstrations in which were not clearly grasped by the compiler to whom he attributes this treatise. It is noticeable that in this work no mirrors are considered excepting those that are plane or spherical, in spite of the fact that by Apollonius and Archimedes the geometry of the conic sections and of paraboloids of revolution was well developed. Excepting the probability that the work was a late compilation, therefore, we must infer that so far as the evidence goes this advanced geometry was not applied, or at least not generally applied, for a very long time, to the study of catoptrics

FREDERICK BARRY

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

**An Examination of First Principles in Thought and Being in the Light of Aristotle and Aquinas.** By JAMES BACON SULLIVAN. xi, 150 pages. Catholic University of America Press, Washington 1939 (Catholic University of America, Philosophical Studies, No. 51)

The purpose of the author in this work "has been only to give an objective and critical presentation of first principles" according to the ideas of Aristotle and St. Thomas. However, he by no means limits his treatment to these two men. The discussion, by way of comparison, contrast and elucidation, involves the ideas of many other philosophers ranging all the way from Heraclitus to John Dewey, among whom are included St. Augustine, Francis Bacon, Herbart, Hegel, Locke, Tongiorgi, John Stuart Mill, Rickaby, Richard Clarke, Maritain, and others. In this manner we are given a comprehensive yet concise view of what has been thought and said on the subject of first principle from the time of Aristotle to the present.

First principles are considered under three main heads, I. First Principles in General, II. First Principles in Particular, III. First Principles in Origin. Under the first heading judgment, priority and principle, order, the necessity and definition of first principles are considered. Under the second heading the seven first principles, the principles of Contradiction, of Identity, of Excluded Middle, of Relational Logic, of Sufficient Reason, of Causality and of Uniformity, are explained and discussed. Under the final heading the question how far logical principles are grounded in reality is discussed in connection with the bases of transcendental concepts, judgments, and the principles of Contradiction and Causality.

While little claim to originality can be or is made for the work, the author has emphasized and correlated certain points in such a way as to make the work a worthwhile contribution to philosophical literature. A sharp distinction is drawn between the first judgments in the *psychological order*, i.e. "the order actually followed in the reasoning of a given mind," and first judgments in the *logical order*, i.e. those "which are first if man's knowledge is arranged in the order of progress from the most general truths to the particular conclusions of demonstration." The limitations of Dewey's position with regard to first principles are pointed out. The formal difference between the Principles of Contradiction (Being is not non-being) and the Principle of Identity (Being is being) and the priority of the former in the logical order are maintained. The work closes with an explanation of the Aristotelo-Thomistic idea of the psychological origin of first principles.

Classical scholars other than those particularly interested in Aristotle will find little of interest in the book. However, the material is clearly presented with a minimum of philosophical verbiage and technical terminology, a fact which should make it useful to those who desire to learn something about first principles but who are not specialists in philosophy.

DONALD KING

HARVARD UNIVERSITY

**Temples of Rome as Coin Types.** By DONALD F. BROWN. 52 pages, 9 plates. American Numismatic Society, New York 1940 (Numismatic Notes and Monographs, no. 90) $1.50

In progress, under a group of New York investigators, is a corpus of Roman coins bearing representations of temples of Rome. The general results of this work are concisely reviewed in the present essay, which, accordingly, offers a convenient means of access to the temple coins of Rome until such time as the corpus itself shall appear.

Evaluation of detail must await the publication of

the material and the reasoned interpretations of the more extensive work. Meanwhile, it may not be amiss to note several matters in connection with the first seven or eight items in the list of coins dealt with in this essay (Appendix A).

The "striking agent" for coins signed by the moneyers M. Volteius, Q. Cassius, P. Cornelius Lentulus Marcellinus, P. Sepullius Macer, et al., was not in the case of the first the "*gens* Volteia," of the second the "*gens* Cassia," of the third the "*gens* Claudia," of the fourth the "*gens* Sepullia," etc.; the "striking agent" of course was the Roman State.[1]

For the first, second, third, and fifth items in the list Babelon's dates are cited as published in the Monnaies de la République Romaine (Paris 1885-6), though in each case the only reference for the issue in question is to Grueber's Coins of the Roman Republic in the British Museum (London 1910), and in each case Grueber has rejected the dating proposed by Babelon.

For the first, second, fourth, fifth, and seventh items of the list it is stated (on page 10, with note 15) that "actual building activity of the moneyer . . . seems to be assured" as the reason for the use of a temple type—a proposition of such a nature that one will eagerly await the details of its justification.[2]

As to the eighth item in the list, *Augustus* could not have issued a Divus Julius coinage in Africa ca. 36 B.C.; *Octavian* might well have, and I dare say did.

In the fifth item of the list, for "Plate I, 7" read Plate I, 8, and in the eighth item for "Plate I, 8" read Plate I, 7.

PAUL A. CLEMENT
AMERICAN SCHOOL OF CLASSICAL STUDIES AT ATHENS

**Un peuple cavalier préscythique en Hongrie.** Trouvailles archéologiques du premier âge du fer et leurs relations avec l'Eurasie. By SÁNDOR GALLUS and TIBOR HORVÁTH. 168 pages, 10 figures; Plates I-LXXXIX. Institut de numismatique et d'archéologie de l'Université Pierre Pázmány, Budapest 1939 (Dissertationes Pannonicae 2.9) 40 pengö

Hungarian archaeologists have to their credit, among other things, two important serials, the Archaeologia Hungarica, published since 1926 by the Hungarian National Museum, and the Dissertationes Pannonicae which are published by the Institute of Numismatics and Archaeology at the P. Pázmány University, Budapest. The latter appear in two series (in octavo and quarto), started in 1932 and 1933 respectively. The work we are now reviewing belongs to Series 2 of the Dissertationes Pannonicae. Its authors, while belonging apparently to the younger generation of Magyar archaeologists, are not mere beginners; both of them have already contributed valuable studies to the Archaeologia Hungarica (Vol. 13 [1934] and Vol. 19 [1935] respectively).

Sándor Gallus has written the first part of the book we are reviewing, which deals with Le classement des trouvailles. Tibor Horváth in Part II has confronted these finds with the results of excavations in Russia, the Caucasus and Central Asia in a stimulative essay entitled L'Expansion de la culture préscythique. There follows the description of plates offered jointly by Gallus and Horváth. The text is both in French and in Magyar. The French is not devoid of certain awkwardness at spots.

The book as a whole is addressed to the specialist rather than to the general reader, as it is too technical for the latter. In the Introduction the authors discuss, however, some general aspects of archaeology in connection with the topic of their studies. Gallus takes exception to the point of view of the scholars of Kossina's school with regard to the ethnic aspects of prehistoric cultures. "Kossina's followers are inclined to see in any homogeneous group of monuments, that is in any 'culture' or 'cultural sphere,' the work of a likewise homogeneous ethnic body." Gallus warns against the fallacies of such an approach to archaeological problems and suggests that different ethnic groups, or different peoples, might coexist within the frame of the same "cultural sphere." He points to the instance of the finds bearing on the cultural sphere of the Great Hunnic Empire: "It is very hard to distinguish Hunnic objects from those of the Ostrogoths. If we had no written sources the distinction would not be possible at all." Actually, the problem in this particular case is even more involved since both Alans and Slavs should be added to the picture.

The "cultural sphere" Gallus and Horváth are studying is represented by objects of the eighth century B.C. to the sixth, excavated in various parts of Hungary. Horsemen are undoubtedly the standard bearers of this culture as proved by numerous findings of bits and trappings. In analyzing the contents of the finds Gallus considers the bits the most characteristic objects of the culture. They are, according to him, the determining fossils ("fossiles déterminants") of the whole material. Consequently, his classification of the finds is based upon the study of the bits available, among which he distinguishes two main types in accordance with the shape and ornamentation of the cheek-pieces (mon-

[1] Cf. Mattingly, Roman Coins 31; Grueber, Coins of the Roman Republic in the British Museum I xii, lxff.; Mommsen, Gesch. röm. Münzwesens (Berlin 1860) 363ff.

[2] For the older explanation of the use of a temple type on these issues see, for the first, Mommsen, op. cit. 620, and Grueber, op. cit. 388; for the second, Mommsen, op. cit. 636, and Grueber, op. cit. 481-2; for the fourth, Grueber, op. cit. 547-8; for the fifth, Grueber, op. cit. 571-2; and for the seventh, Grueber, op. cit. 574.

tants, ψάλια). Most of the bits he studies are of bronze, those of iron appearing only in the sites of more recent period. Bits and trappings of the younger type present an evolution of the earlier type. The former have been found in western Hungary as well as in regions west of Hungary. Because of this both Gallus and Horváth come to the conclusion that the western types of bit may be derived from the Hungarian types and not vice versa. If such is the case, a reconsideration of the origins of some aspects of the Halstatt "sphere" becomes necessary (54).

While Gallus has dealt chiefly with the interrelation of the Hungarian and western finds, Horváth has studied the problem of cultural intercourse between "Hungary" and the East. In his opinion, certain types of Hungarian finds can be derived from those of Hither Asia via Caucasus. Among other things the swastika design on the *ajouré* disks found in Ugra, Comitat of Bihar, is for him an important evidence of oriental influences on prehistoric Hungary. The presence of numerous things of Eastern pattern in Hungarian barrows and graves cannot be sufficiently explained by trade or imitation, and it should be admitted that around the end of the ninth century B.C. some unknown tribe migrated from the Caucasus to Western Ukraine and hence to Hungary. It should be noted that there is no complete agreement between Gallus and Horváth with regard to the comparative chronology. Gallus remarks somewhat cryptically (54) that some of the Hungarian finds in question are older than the Caucasian ones of the same type.

The perusal of the book is made easier by excellent plates which form a separate volume. They illustrate not only bits and trappings, but celts, weapons, and pottery as well. Both Hungarian finds and Eastern parallels are represented. It is rather annoying that no map of Hungary has been appended to the text to help the reader to locate the sites.

GEORGE VERNADSKY

YALE UNIVERSITY

## ABSTRACTS OF ARTICLES

### ANCIENT AUTHORS

**Demosthenes.** ALFRED P. DORJAHN. *Demosthenes' Reply to the Charge of Cowardice.* In opposing the crowning of Demosthenes, Aeschines charged his foe with cowardice as a soldier at Chaeronea. Demosthenes, unable to deny the charge, successfully diverted the jury's attention from it by emphasizing his courageous and patriotic statesmanship in handling Athenian affairs.
PhQ 19 (1940) 337-42 (P. F. Jones)

**Euripides.** LUIGIA ACHILLEA STELLA. *Euripide lirico. II.* This concludes an article dealing with themes treated lyrically by Euripides. Though the earliest representative of the type of poet who secludes himself from life, Euripides shows nevertheless great interest in the politics of his time and a passionate love for his country. He anticipates too the Hellenistic conception of cosmopolitanism, to which he is the first to give lyric expression. He is the first to present passionate love on the Greek stage, a pathological love, bringing suffering and misfortune. But he also represents elevating love, as well as rebellion against the destructive force of love. His lyric effusions on family affections, especially maternal love, are almost modern in the depth of their tenderness and passion. Euripides succeeds in gradually creating a new form entirely his own: the pathetic effect is furthered by a series of interjections, exclamations, interrogations, and repetitions, which however eventually tend to become stereotyped and conventional.
A&R 8 (1940) 3-34 (Charney)

**Homer.** GEORGE M. CALHOUN. *The Divine Entourage in Homer.* It is a convention of epic poetry to adorn important persons and events with divine intervention. The gods may introduce, motivate, diversify, and dignify important episodes. Yet conspicuous instances of divine intervention are ordinarily widely spaced, so that they do not belittle the human characters. This technique is apparent in both Iliad and Odyssey.
AJPh 61 (1940) 257-77 (De Lacy)

——— A. GOTSMICH. *Kekryphalos.* This was a part of the coiffure that dropped from Andromache's head as she swooned at the sight of Hector's corpse tied behind the victor's chariot (Il. 22.468-70). In literature this type of article is not mentioned again prior to the fifth cenutry. G. shows, particularly from statuary and vases, that etymologically the word has nothing in common with κρύπτειν, but is related to κορυφή, as already suggested by Lobeck. It was a cornuted headgear to which a magical significance was attached.
PhW 60 (1940) 412-6 (Plumpe)

**Tatian.** CAMPBELL BONNER. *Rhetologia or Aretalogia?* The word ῥητολογία in adv. Graecos 40 (p. 41, 1-10, Schwartz), which occurs only here, is probably a copyist's error for ἀρεταλογία.
HThR 33 (1940) 317-9 (Walton)

**Vitruvius.** ARTHUR SCHRAMM. *Vorschlag zur Lesung des* [de eo] *Vitr. I, praef. 1.* The corrupt passage originally indicated why the author was known to Caesar. Read: ideo quod primum parenti tuo de<b>eo <favorem, quod ei de architectura> fueram notus ut (Krohn for *et*) eius virtutis studiosus.
PhW 60 (1940) 526-7 (Plumpe)

### HISTORY. SOCIAL STUDIES

ANONYMOUS. *Problemy Marksistskovo Izucheniya Drevney Istorii.* Editorial justifying the study of ancient history by Marxist scholars, based on quotations from Marx and Engels, Lenin and Stalin.
VDI[1] 8.3 (1939) 3-9 (McCracken)

BLOCH, HERBERT. *L. Calpurnius Piso Caesoninus in Samothrace and Herculaneum.* Restoration in an inscription from Samothrace of the name of the consul of 58 B.C., Cicero's enemy, leads to a discussion of his philhellenic activities. The villa at Herculaneum containing the library of Philodemus, Piso's great friend, was rightly ascribed by Comparetti to Piso.
AJA 44 (1940) 485-93 (Walton)

CARTER, W. L. *Roses in Antiquity.* Several varieties

[1]Vestnik Drevney Istorii (Revue d'histoire ancienne)

such as rosa sancta, alba, gallica, are discussed and an attempt is made to identify some possible survivals. Oldest known rose is rosa centifolia or cabbage rose. Little known about the yellow rose (pictured in a fresco at Knossos, 1550 B.C.)
Antiquity 14 (1940) 250-6 (Hansen)

DOWNEY, G. *The Political Status of Roman Antioch.* A general review of the evidence, and special investigation of the meaning of the phrase salvis tributis used with reference to Antioch in Dig. 50.15.8.5.
Berytus 6 (1939-40) 1-6 (Downey)

OLIVER, JAMES H. *Addendum.* Rebuttal of Raubitschek's restoration and interpretation (AJA 44 [1940] 54-9) of the cenotaph for those who fell at Marathon. O. does not accept the view that the second epigram refers to a hypothetical battle of Phaleron.
AJA 44 (1940) 483-4 (Walton)

RICHMOND, I. A. *Ancient Rome and Northern England. A Historical Summary.* By the middle of the first century A.D. Rome was establishing an effective system of occupation: network of fortified roads, police supervision of the land, permanent forts with barracks, granaries, administrative buildings, etc. Then ebbing Roman power in Britain led to the construction of Hadrian's Wall and control of the northern boundary. Discussion of the building of the Wall.
Antiquity 14 (1940) 292-300 (Hansen)

EPIGRAPHY. NUMISMATICS. PAPYROLOGY

GOOSSENS, ROGER. *A propos des secondes funérailles à Hermopolis.* G. cites an example (supplied by J. Capart) of "second burial" in Buenos Aires and a similar custom in Madagascar, in support of previous explanation of **δευτέρα ταφή** in a metrical epitaph (CE 13 [1938] 373-7).
CE 15 (1940) 132-3 (Husselman)

HOMBERT, MARCEL and CLAIRE PRÉAUX. *Les papyrus de la Fondation Égyptologique Reine Élisabeth.* VI. *Comptes du temple de Soknopaios.* A fragment from a roll containing accounts of the temple of Soknopaiou Nesos from the middle of the second century A.D., edited with complete commentary.
CE 15 (1940) 134-49 (Husselman)

KLAFFENBACH, GÜNTHER. *Parerga.* Emendations to readings in (1) an inscription published by Mitford in APF 13 (1938) 18 and (2) an inscription published by Guéraud in BSAA 32 (1938) 21ff.
APF 13 (1939) 212-3 (Husselman)

ART. ARCHAEOLOGY

BLEGEN, ELIZABETH PIERCE. *News Items from Athens.* Reconstruction of Nike Temple and Bastion completed. Geometric and fifth-century cemeteries at Marathon. Middle Helladic remains at Eleusis. Traces of the site of the town of Eleutherae; a third-century temple, and two Early Christian basilicas. The Gymnasium and Bouleuterion of Sicyon. A shrine of the Tauropolic Artemis on Ikaria. Remains and pedimental sculptures of a temple, perhaps that built for Artemis by Xenophon, at Skillous, in Elis. On Corfu a poros temple at Roda, and renewed work on the Christian Basilica at Palaiopolis. Further investigation of a large Early Christian building of Thessalian Thebes, possibly a Bishop's Palace; a Roman cemetery nearby. Excavations about S. Sophia in Thessaloniki. The great Byzantine church of Sparta. Ill.
AJA 44 (1940) 537-42 (Walton)

CAMPBELL, W. A. *The Sixth Season of Excavation at Antioch-on-the-Orontes: 1937.* Topography and history of the main street; its bridge over the Parmenios. Mosaics from Daphne and Antioch: Narcissus, personification of Ananeōsis, a lion probably copied from a Sassanian textile. Partial excavation of an area in Daphne inhabited from the Hellenistic period till the Arab invasion; mosaics and other finds. Ill.
AJA 44 (1940) 417-27 (Walton)

FRASER, A. D. *The Geometric Oenochoe with Crossed Tubes from the Athenian Agora.* No practical purpose seems to be served by the pipes which span, at right angles, the interior of this unique vessel found in 1935. The cross thus formed may have had an apotropaic function. The central figures of the vase have been identified as the Molione, the Siamese twins slain by Heracles, and F. suggests that the vase may have been made at the birth or for the burial of Siamese twins. The other known representations of the Molione in Geometric art, as listed by Hampe, could also be explained as magical deterrents to such monstrous births.
AJA 44 (1940) 457-63 (Walton)

KAHANE, PETER. *Die Entwicklungsphasen der Attisch-Geometrischen Keramik.* A stylistic study of the Geometric pottery of Attica, showing the development of decoration and vase forms from Late Mycenaean to Late Geometric. Four definite periods of Geometric are distinguished, each of about 50 years, from 900 to 700 B.C. Ill.
AJA 44 (1940) 464-82 (Walton)

NELSON, GRACE W. *A Greek Votive Iynx-Wheel in Boston.* The four-spoked terracotta wheel, with eleven iynges perched on the rim, in Attic Geometric style of the late eighth century, is a unique piece. The wheel was made to be hung by cords with its diameter horizontal and in this position can be made to spin rapidly. The peculiar iynx was commonly accredited with magic powers which were harnessed by fastening it, spread-eagled, to the solar wheel, itself magic; even the wheel alone came to be called *iynx*: it served in sun-, moon-, rain-, and above all in love-charms. The word took on the metaphorical senses of love, desire, fascination, and, finally, erotic passion. The chief occurrences of the term in literature are analyzed. In the Pharmaceutria of Theocritus, the *iynx* and *rhombos* are identical, and the *turbo* of Canidia in Horace, Ep. 17, 6-7, is likewise an iynx-wheel, though *rhombos-turbo* is applied also to other objects. Though both the bird and the magic wheel are often represented, no exact parallel is known to the Boston votive wheel. Ill.
AJA 44 (1940) 443-56 (Walton)

RICHTER, GISELA M. A. *Four Notable Acquisitions of the Metropolitan Museum of Art.* 1. An Athenian white-ground toilet box, of about 430-25 B.C. attributed by Beazley to the painter of a white-ground jug in the British Museum. Six Nereids are represented in a domestic setting. 2. A bronze cinerary urn, Etruscan work of about 500 B.C. On the cover are fixed figurines, a nude youth, and four mounted Scythian bowmen. The urn differs from others of the type in several features. 3. A fine set of Etruscan jewelry of about 500 B.C. (except for two pieces). 4. A marble portrait of Caracalla probably made after his death and showing a tendency to idealization in the rendering of the features. Ill.
AJA 44 (1940) 428-42 (Walton)

WACE, A. B. *The Treasury of Atreus.* Investigation of 1939 revealed no sign of construction or restoration of tomb after it was built. Dromos and dome belong to the same period and are part of the same uniform plan. Pottery and figurines confirm the date of L.H. III (ca. 1350 B.C. or a little later). Ill.
Antiquity 14 (1940) 233-49 (Hansen)